Equal Taxation—Hear Sam. Lewis.

We find in the Cincinnati *Enquirer* of August 28th the following excellent article, which (as we are informed by a friend in Cincinnati) is from the pen of that distinguished soldier of Freedom, Hon. Samuel Lewis. Our readers will rejoice to see that Mr. Lewis continues, so far as his feeble health will permit, to labor in the cause of justice and equal rights. No more powerful argument could be presented on behalf of the views promulgated at the Columbus Convention.

MR. EDITOR—The following remarks are not made with any view of aiding the Democratic party in their contest with the Whigs.

The question of taxing bank capital is again revived, and is now put upon the grounds of vested rights in the Banks to be exempt from equal taxation. Without pretending to much legal knowledge, it may well be questioned how far an annual Legislature may pass a law at one session, that may not be repealed or modified at another session, especially on a subject so important as taxation; and if such sentiments prevail now, let us see to it, that in our new Constitution the people may expressly reserve the right of altering or amending all laws as the popular will shall demand.

Leaving the vested right question for a moment, I wish to state the operation of the law as it is, and invite Whig and Democrat to justify it if they can.

The Trust Company have a capital of two millions; her dividend for ten years averaged say 8 per cent. (last year and this she pays *none*,)—now as trustee for another, I represent $15,000 of capital in that Bank, which on an eight per cent dividend, pays $72 tax, that is six per cent. on the dividend, and this dividend is only declared after all expenses are paid.

I represent $15,000 for the same person, which paid last year one per cent. tax or $150, that is, the $15,000 at interest paid in tax more than twice as much as the same sum in Bank stock. But this is not the worst feature of Bank law. This Trust Company, incorporated to accomodate the business of Ohio, established an office in New York, and went so deeply in the foreign exchange business as to lose several hundred thousand dollars, and then declared no devidend for the two years that it has taken her to reimburse her losses; so that she has actually been doing business for two years, on a capital of eighteen hundred thousand dollars, and made up in that time all her losses, without paying any tax.

The bank or its friends will not deny this statement of facts (except I may have made the average dividend too high) and the point is, can such things be right? Let Whigs look this question fairly in the face, divested of party prejudices, and say if they will not require their candidates to pledge themselves, to go at least to the very verge of their constitutional power to put the same tax on Banks as on individuals. While the Bank is exempt from tax *except on her profits*, there are a large number of merchants who have lost heavily the same two years, and yet have paid taxes as if they had large profits; and I am now thrashing the wheat from thirty-five acres of ground, and shall not get as much as will half pay the expense of seeding, harvesting, &c., but the taxes on the land, team, &c., must be paid. Let men of all parties discuss this subject fully, and correct the wrong.

The United States and France—A Quarrel in Prospect.

Wall street and its speculators were thrown into a very amusing excitement yesterday, (United State stocks falling one or two per cent,) by a telegraph dispatch, published in the *Journal of Commerce*, stating that the President, in consequence of some difficulty growing out of the appointment of Mr. Rives, has ordered the passports of Mr. Poussin, the French Minister, to be returned to his Excellency, and so close all diplomatic intercourse with the French republic. A greater batch of blunders could hardly be compressed in a narrower compass. As we have been for some time well acquainted with the nature of the difficulty between the two republics, we shall state the general fact and prick the bubble in its inception.

Soon after Mr. Poussin arrived in this country from France, he opened, or expressed a desire to open, a diplomatic correspondence with the Secretary of State (then Mr. Buchanan,) on two very important points. These points or topics, were: First, a more intimate and beneficial commercial treaty between France and the United States, on the basis of a generous reciprocity, which might increase the trade of the two republics, beyond what it has been of late years. The next important point was a claim put forth by certain French citizens, in Vera Cruz, whose property there, during the bombardment by Gen. Scott, had been injured or destroyed, amounting to $80,000, by one estimate, or $2,150,000 by another estimate. The old administration that of Mr. Polk, received these propositions with courtesy, but referred Mr. Poussin to the new powers who were soon to come in with General Taylor.

Thus far, so far. On the accession of General Taylor, and the appointment of his cabinet, Mr. Poussin opened the same budged with Mr. Clayton. Nothing of any consequence took place on the subject of a commercial trearty, but a very bitter and sarcastic correspondence was the result of the notes on the claim put forth for the loss of French property, destroyed by the bombardment of Vera Cruz, under the command of General Scott. Mr. Clayton, on the part of our government, refused to admit the claim. Mr. Poussin insisted on its validity, and interspersed some very pungent allusions to the honor and honesty of the French govrnment in paying up the American claims of France, some years ago, after the insulting correspondence of Mr. Rives towards the French government. At these allusions Mr. Clayton took fire, and under advice, made a direct communication with the French government, through our Minister in Paris, demanding of Louis Napolean that he should recall Mr. Poussin, or the American government would hold his passports in readiness for his acceptance. To this demand and intimation the French President fired up, and has given a negative reply, and may probably treat Mr. Rives as we are going to treat Mr. Poussin. Louis Napoleon is satisfied with the conduct of his Minister here, and willnot call him. No altrnative is left to the government at Washington from the first stand taken; and, of course, Mr. Poussin will receive his passports, and return to France. Mr. Pousin accordingly, who has been in this city up to yesterday, went to Washington in the afternoon, and will reach the capital to-day, to learn what further steps to take.

This is the whole amount of the difficulty between the two republics. It is a quarrel about etiquette & courtesy apparently, but really about the validity of claims demanded for the loss of French property during the bombardment of Vera Cruz.—By two men of common sense, in any honest business street, either in Paris or New York, without even a dozen of oysters to smooth the negotiation, it might be settled in half an hour. It can never lead to any serious difficulty, unless both governments—both republics—are in the hands of simpletons and sinners. If the French government has an honest claim, it ought to be examined and paid. We are rich, and can afford it. The French paid our claims several years ago, like men of honor. If Mr. Clayton and the cabinet think they can make themselves popular with the American people, by quarrelling with the French republic on a paltry claim, or sympathizing with the despotism of Spain in Cuba, they make the greatest blunder they have yet done. At best, all this is but a tempest in a teapot.—*N. Y. Herald.*

Hear! Hear! New and Important Disclosures

The Cleveland *True Democrat*, a Whig Free-Soil paper, is edited by Mr. VAUGHN, an old and long tried Whig, once a leading partner in the Cincinnati *Gazette*.—Mr. V. knows all about the Whig party for years past—has been in all their secrets—seen with his own eyes and heard with his own ears, the plots and counterplots of the enemies of Democracy, and hence the article below is of double value; it is in reply to a very silly Taylor Whig article in the *Cleveland Herald*, edited by Mr. HARRIS, against whom he repeats the charge of once wanting to be a Democrat, but the Whigs finding him an article for the price—bid high and got him. It is but justice to Mr. HARRIS, however, to say that he makes a much better Whig editor, than had he taken it in the "natural way," because he has no troubles of conscience about what he may be made advocate—the *dimes* are a certain antidote against taking poison.

We call attention to these specific developements. They show, at once, the origin and object of the disgraceful riots of HOLCOMB and his thirty Whig followers of last winter, second only to the infamous federal buck-shot riots that brought Pennsylvania to the verge of civil war. Mr. VAUGHN developes the fact that the unconstitutional act of dividing Hamilton county was started in 1843. But the "elder and wiser Whigs" opposed it as *unconstitutional* and inexpedient! But the more partizan and reckless portion of that party pressed it, but were finally foiled in their wicked course. The developements are rich, and stamp the Whigs, or a portion of them, as the most abandoned enemies of constitutional government, especially when the party is to be subserved. It is enough to startle the blood in every man's veins, to think of the disgrace and riots a few bad men can engender in their secret and mad plots to entrap their followers, and then urge them on from one act to another, until they are guilty alike. The whole article is worthy of deep reflection —*Ohio Statesman.*

From the Cleveland True Democrat

The Parallel—Its Absurdity.

Harris never moves a peg that does not betray his ignorance, and show his heartlessness. See his editorial of last evening. As a specimen of *quibbling*, it is rich; as a sample of reasoning, contemptible. An editor who play thus into the hands of an adversary must ever prove a foil to his own party.

The article to which we refer is headed, "The Non-Intervention Policy of the Free Democracy—An Editor Caught in his own Trap."

The first thing which must strike every intelligent Whig is the parallel drawn.—Freedom, in its length and breadth, is put in comparison with the local issue touching Hamilton county! Is this the temper of the party? Is this its spirit? If so the sooner it perishes the better. That it is the temper and spirit of the editor of the *Herald*, we fear, is but too true; for the man who would ten years ago bargain for a Loco paper, and break the bargain because he could do better in a Whig concern, would as soon praise the Czar of Russ a, if paid for it, as condemn the "brave Magyars,"—as soon fight for as against slavery. We will not judge the party he so blunderingly defends, by his soulless spirit.

The second thing which must arrest the reader's attention, is the utter absurdity of the parallel, upon any principle of logic. Is there no doubt about the constitutionality of the division of Hamilton county in the Whig mind? Is it not a question upon which honest men have differed, and will differ? And does not this difference rest wholly upon law logic? It is so, and no sound mind, or sane man, will question the fact. Now, is there any such doubt about slavery extension? Can there be, under the constitution, any such difference of opinion either as to that, or the creation of more slave States? Mr. Corwin says not. All the Whig resolves of the State Legislature, and county Conventions, up to the time of Gen. Taylor's election, say not. Yet the parallel drawn, and the arguments used to support it, would affirm the contrary, and any man could justly charge Harris with so believing. His stupidity, doubtless, has prevented him from seeing where he was landing.

Now, for a few facts connected with this Hamilton county question, by way of *first* instalment, since the *Herald* will have them.

This division of this county was first suggested in 1843. It caused much debate, and no little correspondence. Whigs were divided in opinion about it—divided as regards its constitutionality and expediency. The older and wiser men opposed it, chiefly on both grounds. As an humble member of the party we were consulted, and, after an examination of the question, concurred in this view. But the more zealous and partisan determined to press it, and at the session of the Legislature of 1844, undertook to carry it through.

The Judiciary Committee of the House, that year, was composed of J. J. Coombs, B. F. Cowen, and R. F. Payne, (Whigs,) E. Archbold and J. H. Ewing, (Democrats.)

Payne, as true to friends as he is to principle, undertook to bring the subject before the committee, at the request of the Hamilton county Whigs, (outsiders,) and did so. All his feelings were in favor of the measure. He resolved to carry it, indeed, if it could be done constitutionally. Judge Cowen, one of our purest and best men, was more cautious; ready to serve his party, but never to sacrifice right.—Coombs, as all Whigs know him, was keen to strike a blow against "Locolocoism," and having as strong party prejudices as Harris, though having considerably more of judgment, honor and honesty. Under these circumstances—with a Whig majority in the Legislature, and a Whig majority on the Judiciary Committee, the question of the division of Hamilton county was brought up, *and unanimously declared, after a thorough examination, and such consultation as questions of this character always occasion, to be* UNCONSTITUTIONAL, by these Whigs.

The general reasoning of the Whigs was:

Whatever is contrary to the clear intent of the framers of the Constitution, as this may be gathered from the instrument itself, without reference to extremes, is unconstitutional.

The division of a county into districts for the election of members of the House of Representatives, is contrary to the clearly expressed intention of the framers of the State Constitution, as may be fairly gathered from the language of that instrument. In proof, examine the following provisions of the Constitution on that subject, viz:

Article 1—Section 2. "The number of Representatives shall be fixed by the Legislature, and apportioned among the *several counties* according to the white male inhabitants above twenty-one years of age."

Same Article—Section 3. "The Representatives shall be chosen annually, by the citizens of each county, respectively, on the second Tuesday of October."

Section 4—Provides that the Representative "shall have resided within the limits of the county in which he shall be chosen."

Section five and six, of the same Article, provides that Senators may be chosen for counties "or districts," showing that a Senatorial *district* may be other than a county, in opposition to a Representative district, which is to be a county, and not part of one.

Again: Article 6, Section 3, provides:

Sect. 3. No new county shall be established by the General Assembly, which shall reduce the county or counties, or either of them, from which it shall be taken, to less contents than 400 square miles; nor shall any county be laid off of less contents. Every new county, as to the right of suffrage and representation, shall be considered as a part of the county or counties from which it was taken, *until entitled by numbers, to representation.*

Satisfying many honest minds that the framers of the Constitution designed a COUNTY, and not a part of a county, to be a Representative district, by prohibiting a new county taken off from an old one, until the new county shall be sufficiently populous to constitute an election district by itself.

Again: The language of the Constitution is *no* stronger to constitute a *county* a *judicial district* for holding a court of common pleas than it is to form a county to be an electional district for the House of Representatives, and the Legislature might as well provide a court of common pleas for a part of a county as to make a Representative district out of a part of a county.

See Article 3—Sections 1, 3, 5, and 6.

This view of the matter shows clearly enough to impartial minds, that counties, and not parts of counties, are designed by the Constitution to be Representative districts, and that to divide them for that purpose, is in violation of the Constitution.

To sum up the grounds upon which the Whigs of '44 acted, were:

That the division of Hamilton county would be unusual and therefore expedient.

That it would bring up a new issue which would weaken the party out of Hamilton county seriously.

That the Ordinance of 1787 limited the election of Representatives by the people, or the appointment of them to fill vacancies by the Governor to counties or townships.

That article 2d in the Constitution, adopted the same language, declaring that Representatives "shall be apportioned among the *several counties*," &c.

But then, as now, we felt and feel that it was a question upon which candid and honest men could differ, and then, as now, we thought and think, that the only way to preserve order and maintain law, was to make no such issue upon it, to let each decide the matter for himself, without any reference whatever to party will on either side.

Yet for this, our neighbor, with unblushing effrontery and calculating sordidness, undertakes to accuse the Free Democracy of dodging, dares thereupon to question its honesty and its sincerity! But he is understood. He has woven a web, and thinks Free Soilers, like buzzing flies, will be caught in it, while the puniest suckling amongst us understands his purpose and sees his weakness. The truth is, our course on this subject has been liberal and manly; our position is one that should command the respect of honest men, and the cheer of every Whig unfed by treasury pap, or longing for a suck at it; and we have only to repeat that Harris and his clique designedly or ignorantly, are playing into the hands of Locofocoism, and will give it, if Free Soilers do not prevent, control in Ohio.

Reasons why the People should Vote for a Convention to Amend the Constitution of Ohio.

Our present Constitution was formed about forty-seven years ago. Then our State was nearly all a wilderness, and contained but 65,000 inhabitants. Now, her population is over two millions. Her immense agricultural productions not only supply all the demands of her own people, but they are filling up every channel of commerce by which they can reach our sister States, or find access to the great markets of the world. Trade, manufactures, mining and mechanical industry, are yearly adding immense sums to our wealth. In short, our condition, in almost every respect, is widely different from what it was, and it will, therefore, readily occur to every intelligent mind that many constitutional provisions, necessary and suitable to our condit on at that time, are not adapted to our condition at the present time. Besides, every work of man has its imperfections, and this Constitution is not without them. While the experience and information acquired in the lapse of half a century have enabled us to appreciate its merits and advantages, they have also shown its errors and defects.—The points wherein it needs amendment, will readily suggest themselves to every democrat. The most important are as follows:

1st. Our Judiciary system is greatly defective. The Constitution requires the Supreme Court to be held once every year in each county, limits the Judges to four, and makes two a quorum After this tour over the State is performed, they are compelled to meet in Columbus and hold a session to review decisions made, and dispose of cases reserved while on the circuit. A Supreme Court thus organized was suited to a new and thinly settled State; and to that only. Litigation has had a corresponding increase with the population and business of our State, and four men, no matter how great their ability and legal learning, cannot do justice to the thousands of cases now brought before them. The important questions in regard to the rights of property, liberty, and life, arising among two millions of people, instead of being patiently examined, fully investigated, and fairly decided, are hurried through with a reckless, inattentive haste, and a remorseless indifference that strike all honest suitors with dismay. When the four judges meet in Columbus to give judgment as a Court of last resort, and settle the law in doubtful cases, the same hurry and negligence mark their proceedings. Thus the law and the legal rights of men are continually changed by that tribunal which was erected for the purpose of making them permanent and uniform.

2d, The right of filling offices by elections should be secured to the people.—Every department of the public service ought to be occupied with servants chosen by themselves, and responsible to themselves; for, if they are capable of choosing a Governor, why are they not capable of selecting a Secretary of State, an Auditor of State, &c? If they are capable of choosing men to make the laws, why are they not capable of choosing men to expound and administer the laws? Do not the people of every judicial district know who are the most upright and able lawyers therein, better than a body of men at a distance? Would they not have a greater interest in making a good selection? But the objection is urged that they would be influenced by partizan feelings, and this would be highly improper. How is it with the Legislature? Does not a whig Legislature uniformly appoint whig judges, and a democratic Legislature appoint democratic judges? The people, then, could be no worse in this respect than the Legislature, and they have motives to do better, which the Legislature has not

3d. Nearly all local, private and special legislation should be prohibited. Three fourths of every session of the legislature is spent in devising and enacting such laws. Besides the waste of time and money, it is a fraud upon the people, for the passage of every law promoting sectional or individual interests, is secured by the Representative agreeing to vote in favor of laws promoting other sectional and individual interests. Thus he hopes to be applauded by his Constituents and rewarded by his friends for his zeal in their behalf, knowing that they will never discover how, to accomplish his object, he *sold* himself to the support of measures about which he knew nothing. But such legislation is wrong in principle. "The greatest good to the greatest number," is a maxim by which the justice and policy of all laws in a republic should be tested, and laws securing peculiar advantages to particular sections or a few favored individuals are at war with this maxim.

4th. The legislature should not meet more than once in every three years, unless called together by the Governor in some emergency. This would be sufficient for all legislation intended for the public good. It would save the State from the annual expenditure of immense sums of money and greatly lighten the burden of taxation. It would prevent those frequent, foolish, and useless changes in our laws which tend so much to increase legislation, to involve legal proceedings in doubt and confusion, and to render the rights of persons and property insecure and uncertain.

5th. All laws, except those by which the faith of the State may be pledged in contracting public debts, should be made subject to repeal. Just so far as the people are ruled by laws which they cannot change, they are ruled by a despotic power. It is an essential principle of Democratic governments that the will of the majority should govern *at all times*, and the majority of this year has no right to make their present will omnipotent on any subject of legislation against the will of all *opposing majorities for twenty or fifty years to come*. For, if in adopting any measure whatever, they should be mistaken in their views of public policy, it is manifestly unjust for them to place their mistakes beyond the reach of reform. If the members of the legislature should disregard the general welfare and pass bad laws from bad motives, it is an outrage for such men to have the privilege of making enactments for any period, like the tyrannical "laws of the Medes and Persians," unalterable.

6th. Every act, authorizing money to be borrowed on the credit of the State, or a public debt to be contracted, should be submitted to a direct vote of the people for their approval, before becoming a law.—It seems to be the tendency of men in our legislative bodies, to become dazzled with new schemes of public improvement, or interested in projects affording chances for private speculation, and, at once to vote for running the State in debt to carry them on, without regarding, as they ought to do, the burthen they are binding upon the shoulders of the people. Our own public debt now amounts to $20,000,000, or ten dollars to every man, woman and child, within the State, and the interest, too, is constantly accumulating. What a tax! and party politicians on all sides acknowledge and proclaim that the greatest portion of this vast sum has been wasted by extravagance, or expended on useless public works, charging the evil, however, on their adversaries. But let the farmers and mechanics reflect that this money must be paid "by the sweat of their brows." All our sister States have shared the same fate with us, and some of them are laboring under a more grievous oppression. In some the public debt amounts to more than twenty dollars for every man, woman and child therein. All experience, then, proves that if we desire, *certainly*, to avoid the gulf of bankruptcy and repudiation into which others have rushed, and to keep the faith of our great State untarnished, we must no longer trust our agents in the Legislature to borrow money or contract debts for us. We must take our own business, in this matter, more immediately under our own control.—*Cadiz Sentinel.*

Friends of a New Constitution to your Posts!!

The enemies of Constitutional Reform are at work to defeat the calling of a Convention to give Ohio a new Constitution, worthy her people, resources and station at the head of the great Northwest column. They view the movement of the masses in favor of enlarged liberty, with as much alarm, as did the honest down easter the appliance of steam to propel vessels, for he argued, the Lord has made wind for that very purpose, and it is flying in His face, and reversing His decrees, to make ships go by your *darnal hot water!*

The Fathers of our State, unwilling to carry their untried experiment of man's capability for self-government to the full length which we now would carry it, prudently vested a large portion of the power in the hands of the Legislature. Since that time, experience hath shown the fallacy of such fears as operated on the members of the Convention, which framed the State Constitution for Ohio, and the people have shown themselves a safer depository of power than those into whose hands it was entrusted, and yet, the conservative spirit of the land, continually attempting to arrest the car of progress, argue that to change the constitution now, is to fly in the face of the fathers of the State, and declare ourselves wiser than they!! And are we not wiser? We have all the experience in government that they had, and nearly half a century beside.—As well might a man be accused of disrespect to the memory of his father, who would pull down the log cabin and erect a substantial mansion in its stead, better suited to the wants of his family, as to accuse those who wish to amend the errors of the present organic law of the State, of disrespect to the memory of the men who gave Ohio a Constitution and changed the territorial into a State government in 1802.

Yet such is the argument—we came near saying, the *only* argument advanced against the change, and we would not have been far wrong, had we so characterized it.

To secure the certain good, which will arise from a curtailment of the Legislative power,—the election of all state and county officers by the people, as well as the other reforms demanded by experience, the friends of Constitutional reform must bestir themselves and devote a portion of their time, to a refutation of the calumnies with which its opponents hope to defeat the measure. Tales absurd and ridiculous—falsehoods, "thick as leaves in Vallombrosia," will be resorted to in order to create a doubt and to prevent men from voting on this question, for they who vote for Representatives to the Legislature, and do not vote on the question of calling a Convention, in reality, from the peculiar wording of the Constitution, vote against the proposition. This fact is well known to the enemies of Reform, and on this loop in the Constitution they hang their hope of defeating the measure. This fact should be explained, and the people made to understand that other important fact, that even, if the Convention when it meets, should not adopt such a Constitution as the people need, or if they should engraft upon it any proposition obnoxious to the feelings of the people—or if any provision should be deemed subversive of popular liberty, wrong or unjust, that the Constitution can be rejected, for it never will, and never can become the supreme law of the state, until it passes the ordeal of the popular will, through the ballot boxes—until a majority of the voters, first accept it, at the annual election. This fact known,—*for fact it is* will at once overthrow, the strongest objection yet raised to voting for a Convention to remodel the state Constitution. Until a new Constitution is ratified by the votes of the people, the present Constitution will remain in as full and binding force, as now. —*New Constitution.*

THE SPIRIT OF DECMOCRAY.

JAS. R. MORRIS, PROPRIETOR.

WOODSFIELD, OHIO, SEPT. 29, 1849.

☞ The editor has been absent during nearly the entire week, and as a matter of course has been unable to devote any attention to the paper.

During his trip round the county, he has met with some queer things; and among others is the charge that the tickets for the democratic convention were so printed that certain men throughout the county were thereby advised what candidates certain democrats about Woodsfield desired or wished to have nominated —This charge is positively and unqualifiedly false. No such arrangement was made. The names of all the candidates were printed in almost all the tickets, excepting only such as were otherwise ordered; and none were otherwise ordered by those candidates who were afterwards successful. The tickets that had all the names printed upon them were so arranged that the name of each candidate came first in turn in some ticket on the sheet.—It may be that some designing politician has so altered a ticket as to suit his own electioneering purposes.

Another charge is that the names of the candidates were so arranged in the paper as to give similar notice as that above referred to. This charge is equally false, and is without the shadow of a foundation. The names of all candidates appeared in the order of their announcement. That man must be hard run who will resort to such dishonest conduct, and cannot raise himself in the estimation of any honest man, either whig or democrat, by pursuing such a course. Furnish us with the proofs of any fraud, either in the printing of the tickets, or in publishing the names of candidates, and it shall be exposed in our next paper.

☞ The French Minister still remains in Washington city. It is stated that he intends going to New York, there to await the orders of his Government. He has, through the interposition of Mr. Crampton, the English Charge, submitted a conciliatory proposition to our Government; but Gen. Taylor refused to permit any official intercourse with him until further advices from the French Government. So says a correspondent of the Ohio Statesman.

New Counties.

MR. EDITOR:—The people of this county are no doubt aware that two new county projects, each clipping Monroe, will come before the next Legislature. These proposed new counties are named Noble and Grandview. Certain interrogatories have been propounded to the candidates for Representative, by the advocates of the Noble county project, which they wish answered These queries are as follows:

1st. If elected will you obey the will of your constituents on local questions:

2d. As a large majority of the voters in that part of Monroe county included in the proposed new county of Noble did, last winter, send up to the Legislature petitions for the erection of said Noble county, will you comply with their prayer?

3d. Who do you consider your constituents on local questions?

I hope that Messrs. Morris and Johnston will answer these questions in the next paper, as all should be made acquainted with the views of candidates on so important a subject. AN ELECTOR.